

Minutes of a Regular Meeting

Approved 4/08/04

Town of Los Altos Hills PLANNING COMMISSION

Thursday, March 11, 2004, 7:00 p.m.
Council Chambers, 26379 Fremont Road
cc: Cassettes (2) #4-04

1. ROLL CALL AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Planning Commission regular meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers at Town Hall.

Present: Chairman Clow, Commissioners Mordo, Vitu & Kerns

Absent: Commissioner Cottrell

Staff: Carl Cahill, Planning Director; Angelica Herrera Olivera, Assistant Planner; Lani Smith, Planning Secretary

2. PRESENTATIONS FROM THE FLOOR-none

3. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 3.1 LANDS OF MEHTA, 14293 Saddle Mountain Drive (15-04-ZP-SD-PM); A request for a Site Development Permit for a landscape screening plan, and a permit modification regarding conditions of approval for second story windows and skylights. (staff-Angelica Herrera Olivera)

Staff introduced this item by reviewing the staff report which included the history of the Site Development Permit application for a second story addition and an attached secondary dwelling unit approved at the City Council level on April 17, 2003. The conditions of approval included a condition requiring all windows facing the Chan's property to have privacy glass. Also, the installation of skylights was prohibited on any portion of roof facing the Chan's property. Staff further discussed the requirements for a landscape screening plan. The staff report provided views of the applicants second story addition and fourth car garage addition. Additional photos were provided by Commissioner Mordo taken from the Chan's residence. In addition to the proposed landscape screening plan, the applicant is now proposing to enlarge the second story window openings and add a skylight on the roofline facing the Chan's property. Attachment 6 of the staff report includes a letter from the applicant and architect explaining the request to modify the windows in terms of architectural aesthetics. Staff recommended that this request be denied as it is inconsistent with conditions of approval #1 and #7 of Site Development Permit 291-01.

Discussion ensued by Commissioner Mordo regarding the Planning Commission's ability to make a recommendation regarding the request for permit modification since the original application had been reviewed and approved by the City Council. Commissioner Kerns felt that an interpretation regarding what is actually facing the Chan's property needed to be made. The condition of approval indicated "all of the windows on the second story". He commented on the

windows on the southwest side of the addition including a deck which is on the opposite side of the Chan's property. The intent was that the windows directly facing the Chan's property, not the ones on the side (southeast). Commissioner Kerns reviewed the original landscape screening plan and noted that some of the trees were not installed.

OPENED PUBLIC HEARING

Mr. Mehta, 14293 Saddle Mountain Drive, applicant, felt the three trees on the Chan property were already blocking the views of his second story addition. Three additional trees would not provide any additional blockage. He does not propose to add any trees to the front of the building. Regarding the windows, Mr. Mehta felt they are too narrow and do not look good on a residence. He is proposing to install a fixed window underneath the one foot deep window with opaque/obscure glass similar to the one approved. This would provide some sunlight and still provide privacy. Also, Mr. Mehta felt that the inside stairway leading to the second story is very dark. He is proposing to add one small solar lens skylight. He would also like to change the windows on the southeast side of the addition which do not face the Chan's property.

Allison Flynn, 44444 Rock Island Drive, Antioch, original landscape architect in 1989, stated that originally the trees were not the issue; it was ground cover required for erosion control. When drafting the plan she did not communicate with the owner to make sure that the trees were actually existing on the east side of the property. When she took the photos of the oak trees in front of the Chan's residence and marked it on the landscape plan, she noted that they were very young oak trees and felt that in five years they would thoroughly provide screening. Their potential is 40 feet high. This is why she felt additional landscaping would not provide any more privacy but just add more trees. She further discussed the size of the recommended 24" box trees which could be a size of 12 feet in height and 5 feet in width.

Discussion ensued. Commissioner Mordo asked for clarification regarding the three trees shown on the plan along the driveway between the applicant's property and the Chan's property asking if they currently exist. Ms. Flynn responded no. They were the trees that were proposed by the architect a year ago for possible screening. They are not currently proposing these three trees as shown on the plan. They are only proposing one tree in front of the building. Commissioner Mordo noted that they do not have a plan of what is currently being proposed. The plan indicates three camphor trees in the front (24" box) as well as five 5-gallon bamboo shrubs. Ms. Flynn clarified that they are showing an alternate plan; however their preference is not to put the trees in. Chairman Clow noted that what the applicant has submitted for a landscape plan indicates three trees in front of the house. Mr. Mehta felt they were not needed since the Chan's trees provide adequate screening. Commissioner Mordo noted the Environmental Design Committee's request for one additional tree next to the garage side. Staff is requiring the three trees as proposed plus the additional tree by the garage.

Stephan Chan, 14295 Saddle Mountain Drive, provided written comments for review. He discussed his existing three trees which are 6 ½ years old. Regarding the landscape screening plan, he agrees with the staff report that an additional tree is needed by the garage at a location that would shield light emission towards his property from the second story side windows. Further suggestions as follows: all trees facing their property be evergreen; add shrubs of

sufficient height to shield auto headlights along the property line in front of the garage; conform with the February 1987 Site Development Permit where two trees are specified in his front planter (condition #3); and at least four trees to be placed on his property at applicant's expense, to "fill in the gaps". He further discussed the photos taken by Commissioner Mordo itemizing gaps. His landscaping was not installed to screen a two story addition. All trees on either side should be 24" box trees, since immediate screening is critical. He suggested that the applicant place on deposit with the Town funds he could use for the planting of four additional trees on his property. He further discussed condition #1 requesting his name be noted in the condition as well as the direction.

Sandy Humphries, Environmental Design Committee, stated that the trees in the back of the residence which have been crossed out on the plans are needed as well as the tree by the new garage for mitigation. She suggested an alternative for the windows by using glass blocks which would let the sun in but provide privacy (cannot open) as long as there was adequate mitigation for the Chan's property. She stated Redwood trees grow quickly, if camphor trees are not available for the side of the garage area, and perhaps the two trees at the very end toward the back yard of the Chan's. She did not agree with Ms. Flynn's statement regarding the growth rate of the camphor trees indicating that they are typically 10 feet in height and 3 ½ to 4 feet in width at the most.

Dot Schreiner, Saddle Mountain Drive, spoke at the Planning Commission and City Council hearings regarding this project. She is requesting that the conditions not be changed, in particular, the size of the windows. She also referred to the light emanating from the inside of the two houses (Lee & Mehta). The more glass, the greater the light source.

Alyson Flynn discussed the size of camphor trees and their rate of growth.

Amy Chan, 14295 Saddle Mountain Drive, stated that when they were building their house, they had to move the site of the house 17 feet to comply with Mr. Mehta's request so they would not face his living area. Now the Mehta's are building directly facing their house. Also, during their building process, the Mehta's demanded changes to the size, shape and roof line of the residence as well as additional setbacks. Now that the Mehta's are remodeling, they do not see the same cooperation with minimal communication. She felt the integrity of the Planning Commission is being challenged. If the permit that the Mehta's obtained was approved by both the Planning Commission and the City Council, how can they now go back and ask for changes that have the biggest impact on their privacy and light pollution. She requested that the Planning Commission uphold the final conditions set forth by both the Planning Commission and the City Council. Regarding the glass block suggestion, she is opposed due to the light pollution.

Mr. Chan stated they would prefer camphor's of larger size, not redwood.

CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING

Commissioner Mordo referred to the construction of the Mehta's one story house which was built prior to the Chan's house which was approved as a one story residence also. The Mehta's were allowed a 30 foot setback in the front property area so they are 10 feet closer to the Chan's than

normally allowed. Also, part of the Mehta's driveway is on the Chan's property. He reviewed the site from the Chan's property, taking photos from the upstairs master bedroom and from the upstairs guest bedroom. Looking from the Chan's master bedroom, which has floor to ceiling windows, the Chan's are very exposed. He agreed with having three or four extra trees on either the Mehta's or Chan's property for critical screening, at least 24" box. Regarding the permit modification regarding the windows, he would do nothing.

Commissioner Kerns discussed several issues: (1) Windows on the northeast side-no change. There are architectural features which will help with style. (2) The east side windows-larger windows would be acceptable with additional landscape screening. (3) Skylights-no problem with a solar tube although after viewing the area, the applicant could put in a large skylight facing towards the back of the house which would provide more light into the stairwell than the solar tube. He felt there were solutions to the dark stairway leading to the second story. He was concerned with condition #3 (4/17/03) asking how they allowed him to get to building plan check without complying with this condition, asking if it was true that the asphalt has not been removed. It was clarified that staff knew of the condition as the applicant requested to wait on the removal in case they were asked to install larger trees than required at the time the house was to be finalized. Commissioner Kerns stated a concern with condition #1 (4/17/03) "all windows located on the second story to provide privacy". He would like the applicants to be able to increase the windows on the east side with the additional planting in appropriate places for screening. He did have a problem specifying a box size without a height and width information.

Commissioner Vitu agreed with previous comments from Commissioner Kerns. She felt the windows should only be limited on the northeastern side of the property. She would not restrict the southeast side of the property. Regarding the landscape plan, additional landscaping is needed. The setback is relatively small there and screening is appropriate on the Chan's property as well as on the Mehta's property. She liked Commissioner Kerns' solution concerning the skylight although she does not have a problem with the solar tube.

Chairman Clow felt Mr. Chan did need some landscaping and felt it was a generous offer to place some of the landscape screening on his property with a deposit to draw against. The Planning Director clarified that they would not be allowed to condition the project for off-site improvements. The plan could be approved as is and the neighbors could mutually come to some agreement where Mr. Mehta installs landscaping on the Mr. Chan's property (private agreement). Chairman Clow continued stating he supports the landscaping as shown on the plan with the three trees filling in the gap. He would make a recommendation to the City Council to not allow changes to the windows. Regarding a skylight, he felt the applicant could return with a separate application to be noticed and reviewed. He was not in favor of any architectural changes but would support the landscaping. Regarding the windows on the east side versus the northeast side, he stated he did not have a recollection of limiting the windows only on the north east side.

Discussion ensued regarding taking no action versus making a recommendation to the City Council.

MOTION SECONDED AND FAILED: Motion by Commissioner Kerns and seconded by Commissioner Vitu to recommend to the City Council to modify (4/17/03) condition A.1. to read "the applicant shall install obscure glass on all windows located on the northeast side of the second story to provide"... (only specifying the north east side), Lands of Mehta, 14293 Saddle Mountain Drive.

AYES: Commissioner Vitu & Kerns
NOES: Chairman Clow & Commissioner Mordo
ABSENT: Commissioner Cottrell

MOTION SECONDED AND PASSED: Motion by Commissioner Mordo and seconded by Commissioner Kerns to approve the landscaping plan as submitted subject to four trees plus one additional tree at the corner of the new garage as recommended by the Environmental Design Committee (36" box 12 high and 5' wide) planted on the Mehta's property or, if agreeable by both parties, some or all could be placed on the Chan's property line. The 24" camphor trees shown on the landscape plan on the east side shall be installed, working with staff, and the County Health Department to accommodate the septic field, Lands of Mehta, 14293 Saddle Mountain Drive.

AYES: Chairman Clow, Commissioners Mordo, Vitu & Kerns
NOES: None
ABSENT: Commissioner Cottrell

This item is subject to a 23 day appeal period.

3.2 ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS TO THE TOWN'S ZONING CODE WITH REGARD TO FENCES (SECTION 10-1.504 (d) HEIGHT; Walls and fences). (staff-Angelica Herrera Olivera)

Staff introduced this item stating that on February 5th, the City Council authorized the distribution of a town-wide public hearing notice in the Town's newsletter to solicit public testimony with regard to the proposed Fence Ordinance. The Planning Commissioners have in their in-boxes a handout which includes the original e-mail comments received so far. Staff has prepared a Comments Matrix that provides an outline of resident comments, the sections in the proposed ordinance the comments refer to, and a staff recommendation for each comment. A legend on the second page of the Comments Matrix identifies the provider of each comment. Staff highlighted a few of the recommendations staff is making based on the comments received: Comments 2 & 3, adding wording from the Nuisance Abatement Code that refers to unsightly fences and violations of the Code; Comment 11, staff recommends the inclusion of a fence variance procedure to accommodate creative fence solutions to specific properties; and staff recommends inserting a new graphic for Comment 12 that addresses additional setbacks when landscaping is required.

Staff reviewed each Comment/Suggestion, 1 through 19, with the Commission. Commissioner Kerns felt there were many fences in Town that were built without permits. The Planning Director stated that they are not changing height limits or setbacks for most

types of fences. They are recommending a change to the height of driveway gates. Discussion ensued regarding the following: non-conforming, illegal fences; and code violation procedures, open space/conservation easements impacts; pathways through conservation easements with gates; color of vinyl coated chain link fencing; existing procedure for fence variance requests; no required setback for deer fencing; and elimination of wording with regards to spacing of posts for deer fencing.

OPENED PUBLIC HEARING

Colette Cranston, 27080 Fremont Road, reviewed her situation where a fence was going in without her previous knowledge. She requested that neighbors be noticed when a big fencing project is being proposed. She referred to her neighbor's project being almost unseen until they removed 12 foot high vegetation to install the fence. They had discussed this situation with the Planning Director because of the impact on their property (changed natural view). When considering the fence ordinance, they should consider that a fence should not be placed on the property line between two owners unless both owners agree. She would hope they would had a public hearing process, especially for a massive fence. If someone is going to install a 6 foot high fence, perhaps it needs to be set back 5 feet when fencing their entire periphery. At least you would end up with a 10 foot corridor if two neighbors were agreeable. It would also allow for a wildlife corridor. She further discussed if someone was putting in a fence of a material that someone else felt was objectionable, shouldn't they be required to landscape and mitigate the impact on the neighbor's view. A fence is not a structure but when it is 6 feet tall, running for hundreds of feet, it is pretty close in terms of the impact it makes.

Carol Gottlieb, 24290 Summerhill Avenue, agreed with the previous speaker in that there should be a process where the neighbor has to sign off when it is along the property line. She stated fences should not be in front of a path; they should be behind the path. There should be no gates across pathways except for Byrne Preserve which is a pasture with gates to keep the horses in. She voiced concern regarding wording for open space conservation easements because if you go through all of the Town documents and the General Plan, it refers to conservation easements, open space easements, and open space conservation easements. The wording should be amended to open space conservation easements, open space easements, and conservation easements to be all inclusive (open space/conservation easements). She asked if an 8 foot high deer fence needed to be set back 20 feet off the property line and are they going to allow all of the property to be fenced with deer fencing? She noted that if her neighbor installed 8 foot high deer fencing, it would be visible to her. She would not want an entire property fenced with deer fencing; only a certain portion should be fenced, perhaps close to the house.

Fritz Mueller, 26075 Duval Way, referred to the statement "minimum setback from centerline of adjacent public or private road" and asked if a flag lot would ever be classified as a private road. The Planning Director stated as long as the driveway is only serving one lot, it would never be classified as a private road.

Barbara O'Brien, 26815 Ortega Drive, compared the proposed ordinance with the City of Woodside's fence ordinance. She stated that Woodside allows the adjacent property owners (effected neighbors) 10 days to comment on the proposed fencing. She felt Los Altos Hills should also provide notices to any adjacent property owners and owners across and abutting private or public roadways from the proposed fence. Also Woodside has thought about wildlife protection in stream corridors. Woodside wording included "no fence, wall, gate, pylon or berm shall be constructed within a stream corridor unless the Town engineer finds that such fencing will not impede drainage flow and the Planning Director finds that adequate provision is made for the passage of wildlife". She felt this was important. She would like to see less perimeter fencing especially along roadways. There should be some deterrent regarding solid fences. She further discussed rural styles, natural materials, and utilizing natural colors for fences. Woodside also has a 50 foot setback from the road surface; Los Altos Hills has 30 feet from the centerline.

Dot Schreiner, Saddle Mountain Road, clarified the distinction between open space, open space conservation easement, and conservation easement discussion based on current research. The open space conservation easement usually refer to easements on public land; conservation easements on private property usually refers to that area of 30% or greater slope or protection if a stream or a grove of heritage trees. Regarding gates across pathways, there are a few of them (i.e. Matadera Creek area where they have blocked off a very long route, and Frampton Court preventing passage to Fernhill Drive). Residents should not lose site of the fact that Los Altos Hills is a rural community and as a goal, trying to keep as much of that atmosphere as possible. Residents are going to have wildlife no matter what they do with fences. The wildlife will go somewhere. She felt there should be an Environmental Impact Report as it definitely has an impact on the whole adjacent subdivision. She hoped this would be addressed in some way.

Kim Cranston, 27080 Fremont Road, felt that the comments staff provided on fences and landscape graphics were good. He emphasized adopting something similar to the City of Woodside so that neighbors can be involved and help determine if some type of landscaping is needed.

Breene Kerr, Sherlock Road, stated deer fencing was never intended to go wall to wall on a property but to protect gardens, suggesting that no more than 20% to 25% of the property could be deer fenced. He felt that the 10-day notice would have been an excellent tool especially for the Cranstons. The drawing regarding Comment #12 is good but unclear as to the recommendation. He suggested that if someone wants to fence along their side and back property lines and they want to use chain link, they should be required to set the fence back and landscape it. This means that if you are going to use fencing that may block wildlife and neighbors may find offensive, you need to set it back from the property line and landscape it. He would encourage people not to use solid or chain link fencing. He also felt it was a bad idea to put gates on pathways. He understands that there are numerous nonconforming fences throughout Town, voicing concern regarding the variance process. He would like to make sure that the variance process is going to allow people to come in and have a reasonable discussion with the Planning Director. He would not want to grant a blanket exemption to everyone on a private road as he felt it would encourage

developers to do wall to wall fencing right up to the private road. But he would like the Planning Director to have the ability, if a fence is in keeping with the rural character of the Town as the Woodside ordinance indicates, to allow encroachment. He further discussed conservation easements and/or a combination of words which allows open fencing for wildlife movement around conservation easements. There should be some flexibility under the variance procedure without having to go all the way to the Planning Commission. The most significant item is the 10-day notice and the setback along side and rear property lines for chain link and other solid type fencing.

Sandy Humphries, Environmental Design Committee, discussed two items: fencing not allowed over deer pathways; and working towards no fencing within setbacks which would allow for wildlife corridors.

Barbara O'Brien stated she did not see anything in the proposed ordinance regarding protection of views or not allowing solid fencing on ridgelines (i.e. fencing on Arastradero Road) or view corridors.

CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING

Brief break at 9:40 p.m.

Discussion ensued regarding the possibility of a 10-day notice process for adjacent neighbors for solid or chain link fences as opposed to a split rail fence unless existing vegetation was to be removed. Mailing labels will be used. The Planning Director did not feel this was necessary and would clog the system. Commissioner Kerns felt that the Planning Director could review the application and determine whether a 10-day notice would be necessary. The Planning Director felt that fences could be addressed during the review of landscape screening, pools, deck, and/or other major projects. In this way, when the notices are sent out for, as an example, a new pool, the notice will indicate the proposed new fence also. This would cover some of the new fences going in. At times staff has used a "neighbor notification" form so the applicant can obtain the signatures of effected property owners who do not object to the proposed project so that it can be approved administratively. Discussion continued regarding setting the fence back a certain distance from the property line versus a property line fence which would require notices or signatures from adjacent neighbors. It was noted that this issue had not been discussed previously.

MOTION SECONDED AND PASSED: Motion by Commissioner Vitu and seconded by Commissioner Kerns to require a 10-day notice for chain link or solid fences that are on the property line. If there is a five foot setback, a notice will not be required.

AYES: Chairman Clow, Commissioners Vitu & Kerns
NOES: Commissioner Mordo
ABSENT: Commissioner Cottrell

Discussion ensued regarding allowing a percentage of the property to be fenced with deer fencing (50% of the property). Deer fencing is intended to protect vegetable and flower gardens and vineyards.

MOTION SECONDED AND PASSED: Motion by Commissioner Kerns and seconded by Commissioner Vitu to allow deer fencing of 50% of the gross acreage.

AYES: Chairman Clow, Commissioners Mordo, Kerns & Vitu
NOES: None
ABSENT: Commissioner Cottrell

Discussion ensued regarding definitions-deer fencing, deer fencing material, 1.75 inch square or equivalent and minimum spacing of deer fence posts. Suggested wording included adding after "polypropylene" "or similar material".

MOTION SECONDED AND PASSED: Motion by Commissioner Kerns and seconded by Commissioner Vitu to: (1) modify the wording to deer fencing: A wire fence like mesh (1.75 inch square minimum) material constructed of ultraviolet stable black polypropylene or equivalent material which provides as invisible deer barrier without changing the appearance of the property. (2) remove the minimum spacing of deer posts (15' apart).

AYES: Chairman Clow, Commissioners Vitu, Mordo & Kerns
NOES: None
ABSENT: Commissioner Cottrell

Discussion ensued regarding Woodside-§153.051 Fences, Walls, Gates, Pylons and, item 4, to be added as follows: "The design of all fences, walls, gates, pylons, and berms shall emphasize the use of natural materials and colors. Open fencing and gates are highly preferred. Unpainted or stained white, brown or gray wood; welded or woven wire and wood posts; natural stone and/or brick construction are preferred."

MOTION SECONDED AND PASSED: Motion by Commissioner Mordo and seconded by Commissioner Kerns to incorporate into the Municipal Code, the following wording: "The design of all fences, walls, gates, pylons, and berms shall emphasize the use of natural materials and colors. Open fencing and gates are highly preferred. Unpainted or stained white, brown or gray wood; welded or woven wire and wood posts; natural stone and/or brick construction are preferred." Exceptions may be granted by the Planning Department.

AYES: Chairman Clow, Commissioners Vitu, Kerns & Mordo
NOES: None
ABSENT: Commissioner Cottrell

Commissioner Mordo discussed the City of Woodside using a 50 foot setback from the road surface; Los Altos Hills has 30 feet from the centerline. The Planning Director, for clarification, stated that the Town's current setback requirements for solid fences are greater than the setbacks for Woodside. For more clarification, it was suggested to expand the diagrams used for illustrating "open fences and gates".

PASSED BY CONSENSUS: To leave (a) Open Fences and Gates; (b) Solid Fences, Gates, and Walls; and (c) Open Driveway Gates as is, only expanding the diagrams.

PASSED BY CONSENSUS: adding to (b) Definitions: Chain-link or Cyclone: A fence of heavy steel wire woven to form a diamond-shaped mesh, except **dark** green or black vinyl coated chain-link fences constructed with matching coated cross bars and caps.

Discussion ensued regarding staff recommendations on the Comments Matrix, starting with #8. "Allow gated openings in OS-CE; example of Byrne Preserve stable."

MOTION SECONDED, AMENDED AND PASSED: Motion by Commissioner Kerns and seconded by Commissioner Vitu to add wording to prohibit fences or gates on pathway easements in or out of open space/conservation easements. Add to #5 - no fence or gate in pathway easements. Add to #5, second sentence, "an encroachment permit from the Engineering Department is required to install a mailbox post or column, if it is located in the right-of-way easement.

AYES: Chairman Clow, Commissioners Kerns, Vitu & Mordo
NOES: None
ABSENT: Commissioner Cottrell

Discussion ensued regarding #12, #13, and #14 with no recommendation for change. It was suggested by the Planning Director when a new residence includes a fence, the notice will include fencing information. This will forgo a separate notice. The landscape screening plan can be handled in the same manner.

Breene Kerr commented on the need for some type of language that would allow the Town to make a finding that fences would have to be back five feet from the property line. This would provide a wildlife corridor. Commission Vitu noted that they felt the justification for the setback was for screening and were not specifically making it for wildlife. Commissioner Mordo suggested adding to (c) Residential and Open Space zoning districts, a statement regarding accommodating wildlife corridors.

MOTION SECONDED AND PASSED: Motion by Commissioner Mordo and seconded by Commissioner Clow to add to (c) Residential and Open Space zoning districts, a statement regarding accommodating wildlife corridors.

AYES: Chairman Clow, Commissioners Mordo, Vitu & Kerns
NOES: None
ABSENT: Commissioner Cottrell

Discussion ensued regarding the following: the last sentence of (5) "any existing fence, wall, gate, or column located within a road right of way or public utility easement may be removed at the owner's expense"; and (8) "or if replaced by an "open" fence meeting all of the provisions of this section, except that replacement with chain link fencing is subject to all provisions of this section" as it relates to barbed wire fences. The replacement of barbed wire fencing built with a permit was discussed although there did not appear to be many in Town.

MOTION SECONDED AND FAILED: Motion by Commissioner Mordo and seconded by Commissioner Kerns to strike out #8.

AYES: Commissioners Mordo & Kerns
NOES: Chairman Clow & Commissioner Vitu
ABSENT: Commissioner Cottrell

Commissioner Vitu voiced concern regarding open space conservation easement perimeter fences and how it applies when there is a conservation easement in the middle of the property. She wanted to make it clear that an owner can fence the perimeter of their property, if it is not in the conservation easement. The Planning Director felt the wording was adequate.

MOTION SECONDED AND PASSED BY CONSENSUS: Motion by Commissioner Kerns and seconded by Commissioner Mordo to recommend to the City Council approval of the Fence Ordinance as amended.

This item will be scheduled for a City Council public hearing agenda.

4. OLD BUSINESS

4.1 Report from subcommittees-none

5. NEW BUSINESS

5.1 Schedule Planning Commission meeting for March 25, 2004

PASSED BY CONSENSUS: To schedule a March 25th Planning Commission meeting.

6. REPORT FROM THE CITY COUNCIL MEETING

6.1 Planning Commission Representative for February 19th – Commissioner Kerns, reported on the following: Lands of Kerns, two lot subdivision; and Lands of Kerns, appeal.

6.2 Planning Commission Representative for March 4th – Commissioner Kerns, reported on the following: consideration of an agreement for services between the Town of Los Altos Hills and Toeniskoetter & Breeding, Inc. for construction management services; and Lands of Los Altos Hills, new Town Hall.

6.3 Planning Commission Representative for March 18th - Commissioner Mordo

6.4 Planning Commission Representative for April 1st - Commissioner Vitu

7. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

7.1 Approval of February 12, 2004 minutes

MOTION SECONDED AND PASSED BY CONSENSUS: To approve the February 12, 2004 minutes.

8. REPORT FROM FAST TRACK MEETING-FEBRUARY 17, 2004

8.1 LANDS OF KITA, 24931 Oneonta Drive (216-03-ZP-SD-GD); A request for a Site Development Permit for a 5,663 square foot new single-story residence (maximum height 23' 6" feet) including a 1,000 square foot attached secondary dwelling unit, and swimming pool. Approved with conditions.

9. REPORT FROM SITE DEVELOPMENT MEETING-MARCH 9, 2004

9.1 LANDS OF LO & LOH, 26870 Taaffe Road (251-03-ZP-SD); A request for a Site Development Permit for a landscape screening plan. Approved with conditions.

9.2 LANDS OF TAVANA, 14125 Seven Acres Lane (206-03-ZP-SD); A request for a Site Development Permit for a 1,106 square foot addition (maximum height 19 feet). Continued to March 16, 2004.

10. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 11:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lani Smith
Planning Secretary